THOMAS

First year Latin texts and methods in America their history and status

Latin

A. M.

1910

UNIV OF
ILLINOIS
LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY

Class Book Volume

1910 T36

M-14-20M

FIRST YEAR LATIN TEXTS AND METHODS IN AMERICA: THEIR HISTORY AND STATUS

875
L23 Th/d

BY

FRANK WATERS THOMAS

A. B. Indiana University, 1905

THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

IN LATIN

IN

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

1910

1910
T36

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

June 3rd 1910

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE THESIS PREPARED UNDER MY SUPERVISION BY

Frank Waters Thomas

ENTITLED First Year Latin Texts and Methods in America: their history and status

BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF Master of Arts

H. J. Baxter
In Charge of Major Work

and
Head of Department

Recommendation concurred in:

H. V. Canter
A. S. Pease

Committee on Final Examination

168020

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

http://archive.org/details/firstyearlatinte00thom

1910
T36

First Year Latin Texts and Methods in America: Their History and Status.

The type of first year Latin book with which every high school boy is familiar is a comparatively modern product. Men are yet living who learned their elementary Latin before any one had dared publish a beginner's book that dispensed with the use of a grammar in the first year. But in spite of this fact the number of such texts is legion. What educational problems have furnished the cause or at least the excuse for this multiplicity of texts, and what theories underlie the numerous attempts to solve these problems, I have tried in this investigation to determine. And it seemed that these could best be ascertained by beginning with the methods and elementary Latin texts first used in this country and tracing their development and evolution into our present embarrassing wealth of first year Latin books.

When elementary instruction in Latin was formally inaugurated in this country by the opening of the Boston Latin School in 1636, the texts and methods were substantially such as had been in use for more than a thousand years. The Grammar used was Lily's Latin Grammar, a famous work that had first been published about a hun-

dred years before. This Grammar was the joint production of Lily, Erasmus and Coret, the latter furnishing an English accidence and the other two, writing in Latin, the syntax. The work was largely a combination and revision of the ARS MINOR of Donatus and the INSTITUTIONES GRAMMATICAE of Priscian with small profession of originality in treatment beyond the adaptation to the needs of English students. And so the methods first used in the colonies, brought entirely of course from England, trace their descent almost directly from Donatus in the fourth century.

One of the first head-masters of the Boston Latin School was Ezekiel Cheever who held that position for nearly forty years. He influenced more perhaps than any other one man, the manner of presenting elementary Latin as practiced down at least to the time of the Revolution. He found the accidence in Lily's Grammar not clear and accurate enough for his use, so he compiled and published one of his own, which remained in use in some schools as late as 1800. This little book was in its ninth edition in 1766, fifty-eight years after the author's death and its title was as follows,-
"A Short Introduction to the Latin Tongue: for the use of the Lower Forms in the Latin School. Being the Accidence abridged and compiled in that most easy and accurate Method, wherein the famous Mr. Ezekiel Cheever taught, and which he found the most advantageous by Seventy Years Experience".

The clearness and accuracy of this book may be judged from a

sample paragraph which reads[1],- "There are five Tenses or Times; the present Tense, the Preterimperfect, the Preterperfect, the Preterpluperfect, and the future tense.

"The present Tense speaketh of the time that now is; as amo, I love.

"The preterimperfect Tense speaketh of the Time not perfectly past; as amabam, I loved, or did love.

"The preterperfect Tense speaketh of the Time perfectly past; with this Sign have: as, amavi, I have loved," etc.

In passing judgement on such a text it should be remembered that there was as yet no such thing as scientific grammar, demanding accuracy of knowledge and of statement. The purpose in studying Latin was to acquire as expeditiously as possible, a reasonable facility in reading and writing the language, with no care for hair-spliting classifications . In brief, Latin was looked upon as the gateway to the humanities, and not as furnishing in its structure the material for any science worthy of great consideration.

The method generally employed throughout this period was fairly simple. First the accidence with its paradigms, rules and explanations, was learned by heart, thoroughly and in toto, section by section. With each day's allowance were given exercises for drill and application, either from dictation or a regular exercise book. As the accidence covered only a comparatively small number of pages, a few weeks sufficed to commit it to memory, and then

1. Cheever's Accidence p. 22

continuous discourse was taken up. First the teacher would translate a passage to them, then the pupils would follow, and finally they would try without having the original before them to turn the English back into Latin. The emphasis throughout was laid on writing Latin. The natural result of course was that while a Latin passage was being turned into English, the boys who had an eye for the future and the reverse process that was to come next day, would covertly learn as much of the original Latin as possible by heart. This very fact, unpremeditated perhaps on the part of the preceptors, was the saving point of the system. For in spite of the vague, slip-shod rules to be learned which alone would have bewildered the learner completely, the vast quantities of classic Latin that were committed to memory, copied and imitated, carried the pupil into the very heart of the language and gave him a standard by which he could pick his way through other and more complicated passages.

This general method continued in vogue without essential change until 1825. Improvements were made however in the texts,- not in method so much as in clearness and accuracy of statement. The Scotch scholar, Thomas Ruddiman, published in 1714 his "Elements of the Latin Tongue", which was the standard wherever Scotch influence was at all felt, and was mentioned in the entrance requirements for Rutgers College as late as 1830. But in spite of the excellence of this new grammar, the English still clung to the

familiar Lily, and when this was revised by Dr. John Ward in 1732, it again was the accepted standard both in England and America. It was however gradually superseded by Adam's Latin Grammar, first appearing in 1772, and on account of its greater clearness and simplicity, the latter was far the most popular text for beginners down through the first quarter of the nineteenth century.

As an exercise book and guide in Latin writing to accompany these later grammars, the most popular seems to have been Mair's Syntax, compiled by John Mair, another Scotchman, and this was the generally accepted standard of preparation for college entrance. It embodied most of the best points in the methods of the previous century, but improved them and added certain excellent features that are desrrving of note. Every rule was followed by one or more examples of "construed Latin" to illustrate it, so the student was not wholly at the mercy of an arbitrary rule. These illustrations were nearly all taken directly from classical Latin, and since both rule and examples were to be learned verbatim, the value to the pupil was doubled. After these, as the author says in his preface, "is subjoined a pretty large collection of explanatory notes, exhibiting the exceptions, the varieties, the elegant phrases and modes of expression that occur in authors and pointing out the meth-od of supplying the elliptical constructions".[1]

The exercises for translation into Latin were in two sections. The first were generally short, being intended purely for the ex-

1. Mair's Syntax, Preface.

emplification of the rule"[1] to which they were subjoined. The second set contained longer exercises and of a sort, to quote again, "wherein not only the rule to which they are annexed is exemplified, but the preceding rules are again brought upon the field, in order to render them more familiar to the mind, and fix them effectually in the memory".[1]

Instead of a general vocabulary, a unique parallel column plan was used, in which the English sentence was given on one side, and on the other the correct Latin words in the form in which they would appear in a vocabulary, but in the proper Latin order. A sample exercise is as follows:-[2]

They say that Marcus Tullius Cicero, the orator, was a very great philosopher; he sent his son Marcus to the city Athens to attend Cratippus, a very famous teacher and be educated by him.	Aio Marcus Tullius Cicero, orator, sum magnus philosophus; mitto filius Marcus ad urbs Athenae, ut audio Cratippus, celeber doctor, et instituo ab is.

The author explains that the purpose of this arrangement is to enable the pupil to make good Latin by attending merely to his declensions, conjugations and rules of syntax. It at least obviated the impossible order and ludicrous choice of words so often met nowadays. At the close of a list of such double-column examples are added two or three more English sentences of similiar difficulty

1. Mair's Syntax, Preface. 2. Mair's Syntax p. 35.

but with no aid in the way of vocabulary. Of these the author says "To the examples are subjoined on each rule a few English exercises intended as another piece of recreation (sic) to the young student, as well as a further trial of his skill. He will be obliged to go in search of vocables, and so, by degrees, learn to distinguish the words that are proper for his purpose from such as are not".[1]

Such was the plan of Mair's Syntax, probably the most popular text of its kind during this entire period. The results from its use were so satisfactory that it remained in regular use in many schools as late as 1840 while the Scotch Presbyterian College of New Jersey, now Princeton, kept it on their entrance requirements list until 1850. Some of the features which it introduced have since been regularly followed and incorporated in practically all beginners' books. One is tempted to recommend other features to the modern writer of Latin Composition texts. At any rate it would be interesting, perhaps astonishing, to compare the prose exercise papers of the boys who used that text, with those of the preparatory students of the best schools today.

x x x x x x

About 1820 there began to be felt in America the first effect of the great scientific movement in the study of the classics, originated in Germany by Wolf. When he insisted in 1777, in spite

1. Mair's Syntax, Preface.

of the university authorities, on styling himself a student of Philology instead of Philosophy, he struck the keynote of terminology that has since distinguished the German from the English school of classical scholars. It was a shifting of the emphasis from the humanistic to the scientific side of the classics. These investigations in the German Universities showed the utter inadequacy and untrustworthiness of the older grammars, and finally when Zumpt's Latin Grammar appeared in 1818, it instantly rendered all predecessors worthless and furnished a new standard of authority for the entire world of classical scholars. But better still, this scientific spirit was turned toward the methods of elementary instruction and an effort made to apply the best and soundest pedagogic principles to the teaching of Latin. Foremost in this work was Jacobs. After winning pronounced distinction by his translations of and commentaries on classic poetry,he turned all his scholarship and talent toward the task of preparing first a Greek and then a Latin Reader for use in elementary classes. The result of this latter work, appearing about the same time as Zumpt's Grammar, was at once accepted as establishing a new era in beginning Latin books.

It was at this period that the first American students began to attend the German Universities, such men as Bancroft and Edward Everett. Bancroft especially was so enthusiastic over the German

methods that onnhis return, he with Dr. Coggswell who had traveled extensively in Germany, inspecting their schools and methods, founded in 1823 the famous Round Hill School for boys. In this school, as far as practicable, German methods were used, and in 1826, Jacob's Latin Reader was translated for use in the beginning Latin classes. This was the limited beginning of the new era in elementary Latin methods in America, a period lasting nearly half a century, in which German influence and the German passion for analysis were completely dominant.

At first the spread of this influence was naturally slow. Adam's Grammar was still in use in most academies and though notoriously out of date, was the most nearly satisfactory grammar to be had in the English language. The task of revising it was undertaken by Andrews and Stoddard. But the patches were bigger than the old garment, so when their grammar appeared in 1836 it was practically a new book throughout, owing far more to the German grammarians than to Adam. No English writer of a Latin grammar has before approached the subject scientifically. In their preface the authors modestly state the difficulty with all prededing grammars as follows: "It will be found, if we mistake not, that in the language of many grammars in common use, there is such inaccuracy, as well as indefiniteness, that many parts, if taken independently of examples, and of the explanations of the teacher, would be wholly unintelligible". Then after illustrating by quoting sev-

eral rules as generally stated, they add "Rules of this kind appear to have been intended not to lead the student to a knowledge of the structure of the language, but to be repeated by him after the construction has been fully explained by his teacher. Of themselves, therefore, they may be said to teach nothing".

Knowing, no doubt, the affection in which a book was held that had been learned by heart by three generations, they tried, out of deference to the old-time school-masters, to keep at least the paradigms of Adam's Grammar. But three of these even had to go. Apologetically, they explain that there is no classical authority for learning penna as a pen, so it gives way to musa as the first word to be learned by the tyro when laying siege to the first declension. Just as reluctantly, doceo and lego are relinquished for for moneo and rego as the second and third conjugation types, because both the former verbs are afflicted with irregularities in their second or third stems, and because also lego could not "from its peculiar signification, properly be used in the first and second persons of the passive voice". Thus ended the time-honored leadership, especially of doceo, that had stood as the unchallenged exemplar of the second conjugation since the days of Donatus.

Within the next three years, a complete set of three elementary Latin texts to accompany the Andrews and Stoddard Grammar were put out under the same editorship. They consisted of Andrew's First Lesson's in Latin, a revision of Jacob's Latin Reader by

Döring, and Andrew's Latin Exercises for translation into Latin. This Andrews and Stoddard Series held an almost complete monopoly in the leading academies especially of New England, from 1839 until the Harkness series appeared about 1865. In this time only the "First Lessons" met serious competition and this text was rewritten at least twice, the lasttime being so vitally altered as to change the plan completely.

The only other grammar of any prominence to appear in this period was Bullions', first published in 1841. Externally it claimed closer relationship to Adam's Grammar that did the Andrews and Stoddard text, but in treatment was even more concise and logical than the latter. Not having the advantage of a related series it never attained the popularity of its rival. At the end of each topic it had a meager list of Latin - English and English - Latin exercises, but these were inadequate to take the place of a regular accompanying beginner's book. Its general treatment was so similiar to that of the Andrews and Stoddard Grammar that the principles and methods which I shall discuss later apply equally to both.

In 1845 Weld's Latin Lessons and Reader appeared and about the same time Andrews added a reader to his "First Lessons". Weld took all his rules and definitions from the Andrews and Stoddard Grammar under a copyright license, and the chief difference between his text and that of Andrews was in a greater fullness of

treatment and more copious supply of examples. Its popularity was about equal to that of its rival, and wherever it was used, it was generally accompanied by Kreb's Guide to Latin Writing, translated from the German by Taylor.

Before discussing the educational theory and mode of presentation that characterized these texts and their use, one other beginner's book must be described, one which was such a marked advance over anything that had preceded as to be in a class by itself. This was Arnold's First and Second Latin Book. It was based on the system of language teaching originated in Germany by Ollendorf, and adopted by Thomas K. Arnold for his entire series of language texts for the English schools. The American edition was revised by J. A. Spencer and a combination made of what had originally been two books. The first principle of the Ollendorfian system was that no rule or even inflection should be given the pupil to learn without giving him at the same time or earlier, its use and application. He should never be called upon to learn things that are to him meaningless, and when he does begin learning the various forms and rules, the plan is to fix them by continued and repeated use in actual sentences. So the first lesson in this text gives a general explanation of the different declensions and the key for distinguishing them when the first two forms are given in the vocabulary, but of inflected forms, it gives only the accusative singular endings for the five declensions thus;-

1.	2.4.	3.5.
am.	um.	em.

A note adds that the neuter accusative is like the nominative . With them, it explains the use of the accusative as direct object, and also states that the nominative is the first or uninflected form. The second lesson explains how to find the root of verbs whose infinitive ends in <u>are</u>, and then shows how to form the present, imperfect and future tenses of the third person singular by adding to that root <u>at</u>, <u>abat</u>, and <u>abit</u> respectively. Thus the pupil by merely learning six inflectional endings is given the mastery over complete Latin sentences, consisting of subject, verb and object, with a range of three tenses for his verbs, and all the declensions for his nouns. This powerful appeal to interest through mastery is kept throughout the text. The next three lessons add the endings for the other three conjugations in the same tenses, so that the pupil by the end of the fifth lesson is able to handle in a simple sentence practically any noun or verb in the language. Then the genitive singular endings for the five declensions are added in a single lesson, with explanations of the chief use of the genitive. With all these lessons after the first is a copicus supply both of Latin - English and English - Latin exercises, covering not only the new point, but all that has preceded. In fact the striking feature of the book is its wealth of translation exercises, evidently on the theory of "Learning by Doing".

From the sixth lesson on, the other case-forms with their chief uses follow one at a time until completed, then the other tenses and the passive voice of the verb. The other personal endings, that is, those for all except the third person singular are not introduced until the forty-first lesson, after all the tense signs are firmly fixed, and the point is made that only the final - t of the verb forms as already learned will suffer changes on account of the variations in person and number of the subject.

The emphasis throughout the book is on pedagogy rather than on severe philology. If an absolutely correct and scholarly rule is complicated and difficult for the boys to learn, while another can be devised that will cover ninety-five per cent of all cases and at the same time be fifty per cent easier to learn, the latter is given the preference. Unimportant exceptions are passed over. When unusual constructions must be learned, they are often set in rhyme, on the theory that they can thus be committed to memory with the least possible mental drudgery. A fair sample is this:-

'Carēre', want or am without,
And 'egeō,' require
Or need, do both, without a doubt
An ablative desire.[1]

A much more comprehensive but less musical rule was chanted as follows:-

1. Arnold's First and Second Latin Book p. 88

A dative put - remember pray -
After envy, spare, obey,
Persuade, believe, command; to these
Add pardon, succor and displease,
With vacāre 'to have leisure,'
And placere, 'to give pleasure':
With nubere (of the female said)
The English of it is 'to wed':
Servīre add, and add studēre,
Heal, favor, hurt, resist, and indulgēre.[1]

The American editor of the book apologized for these rhymes and confessed that he did not approve of the plan, but retained them as they were in the original text on the advice "of those whose judgement was entitled to great weight". This note of apology seems to give us the secret of the book's failure to attain the general popularity which it deserved. Its pedagogy was not suited to the demands of the Latin teachers of that day. The time had not yet come when the search was for methods that should make the work easier for the student, especially if any compromise with the Latin Grammar was involved. On the contrary the quest was rather in the opposite direction.

I have given this detailed account of the principles followed in Arnold's text, then not because it typified the characteristic

1. Arnold's First and Second Latin Book p. 67

methods and theories in elementary Latin teaching of the period, for it did not, but rather because of its striking contrast to the general trend and especially because it contained the germs and suggestions of practically all the best principles underlying our modern first year Latin books. The tendency of the best late texts seems to be toward approximating some of its most characteristic features and methods. For example one of the most recent (Inglis and Prettyman) extends the first declension through the first five lessons, taking up only one case with its form and uses at a single lesson, following , as will be observed, almost precisely the plan of Arnold.

But the most widely used texts of the period beginning about 1835 and lasting for about thirty-five years were meant to be sternly scientific and severely philological. The watchword was "Thoroughness" which was to be secured at any cost. That period of nearly half a century was the Golden Age of the Classics in this country. They held absolute dominion in the realm of learning. The methods of instruction were meant to be worthy of the royal regime, and no one was admitted to the court of scholars until he had literally counted every stone in the imperial highway leading thereto. The methods of Latin instruction throughout that period deserve our careful study, as traditions of that age coming down as a legacy to our own time furnish elements which complicate our beginning Latin problems to a degree much greater than is generally

recognized.

The beginning books in general were, except for the translation exercises interspersed, mere abridgements of the grammars, keeping not only the same wording of rules but also the same order of presentation. The culmination of this theory was in one text in which the author boasted that "all the grammatical portions of it, even to the numbering of the articles, are introduced in the exact form and language of the author's Grammar. Indeed the paradigms are not only the same as in the Grammar, but also occupy the same place on the page; so that even the local associations which the learner so readily forms with the pages of his first book may be transferred directly to the Grammar".[1]

In no case was the beginner's book intended to furnish material for the entire first year's work. As a rule only a few months at most were spent on the beginning book, - often only a few weeks, - merely enough to give the pupil a general knowledge of the essentials of the language in their relations, before marshaling his Grammar, Reader and Exercise Book for a three-fold inexorable investment of the Latin language from border to border, a grim assault in which no quarter was given and not even the minutest exception to the most inconsequential rule was allowed to escape. The beginner's books contained much more grammar than the college Freshman of today is expected to know, but they were mere stepping stones to the treasure-house of knowledge in the big

1. Harkness Introductory Latin Book, Preface.

grammar. German scholars had unearthed an appalling mass of individual facts about the science of Latin Grammar, but not enough time had yet elapsed to determine the relative value of each, so most of them, whether important or not, found their way into the grammars. After a rule would come a long list of exceptions, many of them being words that the student would never again see in four years of ordinary Latin reading. But they were in the grammar, so they were learned to the last letter. How completely every rule and word-list was committed to memory is illustrated by an incident related by Mr. Charles H. Deshler in the History of Education in New Jersey prepared by Dr. David Murray. A friend of his was asked by his son to take his Andrews and Stoddard's Grammar and see if he could repeat correctly the list of twenty-six prepositions that govern the accusative. But before the boy got started, the old man said, "Hold on, Lew! It's been thirty years since I thought of that list of prepositions, but I believe I know them yet". And accordingly he closed the book and went through the entire list without slip or hestitation.

But the process did not consist merely in learning rules - Latin had been taught in that way a century before. The most important and characteristic feature was the intensely analytic handling of each word in the Latin sentences and the application to it of every section in the grammar that had the remotest bearing on the case in point. Grammatical analysis and parsing were spun

out to a marvelous nicety. The texts throughout this period show a constantly increasing tendency to carry this to an extreme. The simplest model for analysis to be found in any of those texts was in the first edition of Andrews and Stoddard's Grammar, appear ing in 1836 at the very beginning of this tendency. They analyze as models three sentences of varying complexity, the simplest of which contains only five words and is analyzed as follows:-

Saevius ventis agitatur ingens pinus..

Ingens pinus is the logical subject; saevius ventis agitatur is the logical predicate.

The grammatical subject is pinus, this is modified by ingens.

The grammatical predicate is agitatur: this is modified by saevius and ventis.

Pinus is a common noun, of the second and fourth declension, feminine gender, and nominative sase.

Ingens is an adjective, of the third declension, and of one termination, in the nominative case, feminine gender, agreeing with pinus.

Agitatur is an active frequentative verb, of the first conjugation from agito, derived from ago (Name its principal parts), formed from the first root. (Give the formations from that root.) It is in the passive voice, indicative mode, present tense, singu - lar number, third person, agreeing with pinus

Saevius is an adverb, in the comparative degree from saeve or

saeviter, derived from the adjective saevus, modifying the verb agitatur.

Ventis is a common noun, of the second declension, masculine gender, in the plural number, ablative case.

How much time in recitations was required for such analysis may be inferred from the fact that on the next pages of the same text a model analysis is given of a typical Latin sentence of four and one half lines. The model contains one thousand four (1004) printed words, while the principal parts, synopses, comparison of adjectives, etc, called for in brackets would bring the total up to nearly double that number. The recitation hour would hardly have sufficed for dismembering a single sentence of a half-dozen lines, had not the boys been trained to rattle off these forms with a rapidity, the mere hearing of which would all but paralyze a modern Latin student.

Bullions' Grammar went more into detail in this subject than did Andrews and Stoddard's, especially in insisting on the repetition, of the rules and sections of the grammar wherever they applied to a point in the analysis. His attitude may be sufficiently shown by the following bare outlines which he gives for parsing nouns and verbs:

I. Nouns.- 1. Kind; 2. Gender; 3. Declension; 4. Decline it; 5. Derived from (if derived); 6. It is found in - Case; 7. Number; 8. is the nominative to (if the nominative), is governed by - (if

governed).. 9. Rule.

IV.. Verbs - 1. Kind, viz., Transitive, or Intransitive, (or if preferred, Active or Neuter;) 2. Conjugation, (or Irregular, if it is so.) 3. Conjugate it; 4. Derived from, (if derived;) 5. Compounded of - (if compounded.) 6. It is found in - Tense. 7. Mood; 8. Voice; 9 . Person; 10. Number; 11. Agrees with - as its subject; 12. Rule; 13. Give a Synopsis.

This method of minute analysis seems to have been originated by Ollendorf as the best means of securing the "frequent repetition" that he considered as half the secret of successful language teaching. When Andrews and Stoddard adopted it into their texts and illustrated it as has already been shown, they gave it the following optimistic commendation: - "The practice which we would respectfully recommend is that which we have presented at the close of Syntax under the head Analysis. When language is studied in this way, it ceases to be a tiresome and mechanical employment, and not only affords one of the most perfect exercises of the intellectual faculties, but, in a short time becomes a most agreeable recreation"

The modern teacher of Latin will naturally ask. How did they manage to get all this done? An examination of the Courses of Study for the first year in the preparatory schools of that day will furnish the answer. For example at Exeter in 1850 the first year's work covered the following : - Andrews and Stoddard's Latin

Grammar, Andrew's Latin Lessons, Andrew's Reader, Arnold's First and Second Latin Book, Viri Romae, Exercises in Latin Writing, Caesar's Commentaries (complete) or Nepos, and Bucolics of Virgil. No sciences, - they were reserved for the college. No mathematics, - arithmetic had already been learned while algebra and the rudiments of surveying came later along with Euclid. No English as such, - they were now getting ready to read it intelligently. Just Latin, that's all ! Three subjects were considered enough for one student to carry; with no excuse for his not learning them thoroughly. These three daily recitations were in, First, The Beginning Lessons, superseded after a few weeks by the Grammar; Second, The Exercise Book in Writing Latin; Third, The Reader followed soon by Viri Romae and Caesar. These furnished not only an ideal example of that Correlation of Studies which modern educators strive after so frantically and fruitlessly in the constantly growing hodge-podge of our average high-school curriculum, but also furnished adequate facility for that concentration of effort essential to the mastery of any subject , and especially a language. The results of this massing of time in learning a language are far out of proportion to those obtained in the same number of hours scattered through twice as many weeks. In studying German for example, it has been demonstrated that a greater mastery of the language can be obtained by six weeks of systematic <u>study in Germany</u>, than by six years in the class-room in this country reciting the ordin-

ary four hours a week through the school year.

Although the course of study was apparently limited in the classical preparatory schools of those days, the training received was by no means as one-sided as might be inferred. So many mental faculties were called into play by the methods of teaching Latin then employed that it amounted in itself to a fairly liberal education. The modern science-teacher can hardly claim that his students learn greater keenness of observation or accuracy of classification then did those boys in their parsing who instantly caught and interpreted every letter in a maze of ending, and unerringly traced irregular verbs to their proper catagory. Mathematical relations as complicated as to be found in the binomial theorem were involved in the rigid analysis which probed for the subtleties of coordination and subordination and demonstrated the equality of inequality of members. As for English, when one compares the accuracy and definiteness, both of expression and interpretation, then attained, with the lack of both in the modern high-school graduate, he is inclined to wonder if the best way to teach English is not to teach something else. The systematic training of memory as then practiced has no parallel in our present curriculum. That such training was not narrowing or one-sided is evinced in the great scholars of the past half-century and more, practically all of whom were trained in that way. It is not the province of this discussion to extol that system by further illustration, but

rather to take accurate note of the extent of its success in actual application. For the men who dictate the entrance requirements in Latin for most of our universities remember what desirable students such training furnished them, and they still keep demanding a similarly thorough Latin preparation in the students who apply for admission, regardless, apparently of present high-school conditions. That fact furnishes one important element in the troublesome first year Latin problem.

After nearly thirty years of popularity, the Andrews and Stoddard texts were superseded about 1865 by the Harkness series. The differences in the two series were, however, by no means radical. The advanced scholarship, the better organization of old material, the gradual establishment of a standard of values, so to speak, which could differentiate the important facts from the trivial so far as elementary study was concerned, and finally the perfection of those methods of analytical study which the older texts had introduced, all served to demand new texts which should embody these improvements. So the appearance and adoption of the new series occasioned no essential change in the methods employed.

Harkness had published a First Latin Book as early as 1851 while teaching in the Providence High School. He had based this on Arnold's books, and in the arrangement of material made some little appeal to interest by the early use of complete sentences. This first effort, however, met no very general acceptance. Another

text was brought out in 1859 by C. S. Richards, who protested that the prevailing methods were too intensely analytical, so that the student failed to see the unity and connection. His book was more a manual for use with Andrews and Stoddard's Grammar than a text in itself, or as he called it,"a judicious system of memorizing the grammar" together with translation exercises. His point seems to have been not to omit any analysis but to go more slowly and synthesize as well. Outside his own locality in New England, his book gained no especial popularity.

After his first attempt at text-book writing, Harkness spent two years in Germany as a graduate student and upon returning to Brown as Professor of Greek, he turned his finished scholarship to the task of preparing his famous grammar and the preparatory texts that accompanied it. His "Introductory Latin Book", appearing in 1866 as the last of the series, while "offered as the successor" of his "First Latin Book", bore very little resemblance to that text which had appeared fifteen years before. No trace of Arnold's influence was apparent, but unstead it followed the arrangement of the Grammar throughout, as a dutiful handmaiden, and not a single verb form or complete sentence was presented until after fifty pages of drill on nouns, adjectives and pronouns. His model for parsing nouns, introduced in the opening lessons, after the first and second declensions, contained seventy-nine words, exclusive of five sectional references, and ending with a rule to be committed

and repeated wherever it had bearing. As a model of fullness and artistic finish, it left nothing to be desired. Indeed the Harkness series in general was the consummation of the period of analytic thoroughness and philological exactness, and until conditions began to change they stood without serious competition as the standard texts for the whole country.

About 1870 there began a general movement in secondary education that was of utmost significance to the classics, and especially the elementary instruction in them. Up to that time, preparatory training had been given almost exclusively in academics. A tuition fee was charged and most of the students came from the more cultured and well-to-do families. In response to the demands both of such patrons and of the colleges for which they prepared, the key-note of the curriculum was absolute thoroughness in classical instruction. But during the seventies the number of free high schools kept multiplying. Instead of the few scattered representatives that had been in existence for a number of years, such as the famous Central High School of Philadelphia they were established in nearly all the important cities of the country. By 1880 the number had reached nearly 500 and was doubling every other year. The dominant tendency everywhere was to popularize secondary eduaation. The natural effect upon the curriculum was immediate. People began to talk of "broadening the Course of Study", and a popular demand was heard for the addition of more utilitarian sub-

jects. This general movement affected not only the new high schools but even the most conservative. Classical Academies, and Latin was forced to divide time in the first year with mathematics, science and history. The extent of this change may be seen in the Course of Study for the first year's work at Exeter in 1872 and again in 1880. In the work outlined for 1872, Latin is practically supreme, no other subject being offered except Greek and Roman History, which after all does not go outside the Classic family. In Latin the work covers the Grammar amd Composition through Prosody, while the reading includes eight books of Caesar's Commentaries and the first book of the Aeneid. Eight years later in the same school there had been added as texts for the first year, Hill amd Wentworth's Arithmetic, Hill's Geometry for Beginner's, Barnes's History of the United States and Lamb's Tales from Shakespeare. In consequence of this division of time, the first years Latin extended over only six books of Caesar, at least one-third less than in 1872. This division of energy, time and interest among the various subjects, weakened greatly the efficiency of instruction and mastery of Latin Grammar that had formerly chacterized first year Latin classes. This lack of power necessarily diminished the amount that could be covered in the first year as indicated in the course of Study.

The grammar of this transition period was Allen and Greenough's. Though first published ih 1872 it did not at first win

great popularity for beginning students. It was based on comparative grammar and frankly intended to be comprehensive enough for use throughout college. A demand was growing for a book that required less instead of more time than the old Harkness. But in 1876, the same publishers brought out Leighton's Latin Lessons, especially prepared to accompany the new grammar, and the two came into immediate popularity together. Leighton's text did much to relieve the dryness of beginning Latin as generally taught. He aimed as he says, "first, to introduce, very early in the course, a comparison of the simpler verb-forms, which are easier than nouns, and open the way for a much larger range of expression; and secondly, to give not bare words and their inflections, but sentences from the start, both questions and answers, in natural, and easy succession".[1] The wisdom of giving enough verb-forms for complete sentences, in the opening lessons has been universally acknowledged since that time, and the writer has been able to discover only one text published since 1880 which postpones the introduction of complete sentences later than the second lesson. With its appeal to interest, Leighton's book made no sacrifice of thoroughness, and the lists of translation exercises are almost appallingly copious, quite beyond the capabilities of modern high school Freshmen.

The record of that decade would not be complete without mention of the first beginners' book originating in the West, the First

1. Preface, Leighton's Latin Lessons.

Lessons in Latin by Prof. Jones of Michigan, later famous for his rigorous composition books. His text is avowedly a drill-book, with references complete for use with any of the seven best grammars then extant. Variety is sought by alternating the verb-forms with the declensions, but the chief feature of the book is the uncompromising thoroughness, so characteristic of the author and his work.

The present era of multitudinous beginning Latin texts and of peculiar conditions that have called them forth began about 1880. In scarcely any school after that date was the attempt made to read any very considerable amount of Caesar. The demand everywhere since then has been for a text that can give the pupil such a mastery of the elements of the language as to enable him to commence the reading of Caesar with facility at the beginning of the second year. The host of books presuming to satisfy this requirement are with two or three early exceptions alike in one point which distinguishes them from practically all their predecessors. They dispense entirely with the use of a regular grammar in the first year and give instead such essentials of Latin as are deemed absolutely necessary to beginning a regular author, these being simplified or in many cases diluted, so to speak, in presentation so as to meet the mental capabilities of high school Freshmen. In order to understand and appreciate the various methods and plans of this constantly increasing army of texts, it is necessary to know

thoroughly the exact nature of the problem to be solved and the difficulties involved in leading an average high school Freshman of the present day from the state of absolute ignorance of Latin and barely speaking acquaintance with the mother tongue, to a proficiency that will enable him to meet successfully the connected narrative of Caesar.

The problem is inherent in the conditions attending the wonderful increase in the number of high schools during the past thirty years. In 1880 there were not quite 500 in the United States. Eighteen years later 5300 were reported, and the rate of increase has been maintained since, though late statistics are conflicting on account of different opinions as to the exact amount of work above the eight grade necessary before the term high school can be justly applied. The spread of the high school meant the popularizing of the Course of Study, so that now practically half of the subjects in the curriculum are innovations undreamed of as high school courses thirty-five years ago. These new subjects were introduced because of their utilitarian value, their direct appeal to interest or both. Under the stress of the barbarian invaders such subjects as Latin and others which make a less direct appeal to interest were constrained to maintain themselves by such jettison and compromises as the conditions demanded. The confessed deterioration in the effectiveness of elementary Latin instruction during this time may be traced directly to four distinct

causes.

The first and most obvious of these causes is the division and dissipation of time, energy and interest. In the crowded curriculum no subject receives enough energetic and consecutive study for its mastery and complaint of this is heard from all departments. But Latin, being a difficult foreign language suffers most. Reference has already been made to the need of massing time in the study of a foreign language. America is practically the only country in which it is presumed that beginning Latin can be satisfactorily taught by spending on the subject only five periods each week, with each period less than an hour in length at best. Scientific Germany assigns in the gymnasium eight hours each week to beginning Latin and two years of this before Caesar or Nepos is begun. The writer demonstrated by actual experiment a year ago with two sections, in both of which most of the students had had exactly the same first year's preparation, that a class reciting ten hours a week can read in nine weeks four books of Caesar as satisfactorily as a similar class can do in twenty-eight weeks reciting only five hours a week, while the actual power of the first class at the close of that time as shown in sight translation far exceeded that of the class which had taken Caesar in smaller and more segregated doses. This time element is rarely mentioned, however, by those who make pessimistic comparisons of the results of present Latin teaching with the finished proficiency attained a generation

ago. The second and third causes are to be found in the changed educational methods in vogue in the grades. First, formal grammar has been superseded to a great extent by vague "language work". The methods of thorough analysis and parsing in the old style text such as Harvey's Grammar, have been condemned as dry, mechanical and devoid of human interest. The inductive methods now in vogue probably have greater educational value, but the students in the end have unquestionably less power in determining the function of the various words in a sentence and their part in expressing the thought, than did the students using the old style English Grammar. The Latin text writers of forty years ago lamented that "beginning students are often defective in English Grammar, for example not distinguishing a noun-clause from an adverb-clause". Imagine that writer's consternation if he were to face a modern class of high school Freshmen and discover that ninety per cent of them were unable to distinguish a predicate nominative from a direct object! The later texts and all experienced Latin teachers have ceased to assume that beginning students have any definite understanding whatever of English Grammar. Fully half the time of the first year in Latin is consumed in teaching constructions that are exactly as in English though apparently none the less novel to the pupils on that account.

The next cause originating also in the grades, is the meager training of the memory in modern methods. Under the old pedagog-

ic regime a lesson was assigned and the pupil told to learn it. This in actual practice meant memorizing it for the most part ready to reproduce it in recitation. So when he came to Latin, where memorizing of paradigms was and must always be absolutely essential, his previous habits made proficiency easy and natural. But under the present inductive methods, the pupil is given instead a list of examples to look over. Then in recitation he is cross-examined by the teacher until finally driven to confess that he sees the point in the examples, and with more or less assistance he formulates a statement of the principle involved. In general educational value, though all confess that modern principles are a great advance, yet the complaint is often heard from many quarters that our schools ignore memory-training. This can best be understood by any one who has had charge of a class of high school Freshmen and has seen the look of hurt surprise when they are first told that they must actually learn by heart a page of paradigms.

The final cause of deterioration is in the lower average of preparation and efficiency in Latin teachers. There was a time when the Latin schoolmaster knew his grammar in toto. But during the twenty-five years when nearly 400 new high schools were being established annually, the supply of competent teachers was pitifully inadequate. And in every fledgeling high school, however insignificant, beginning Latin is always offered, a fact which furnishes encouraging statistics to those who put their faith in figures to

show that Latin is being studied by a constantly increasing number of pupils. Even yet, practically any one who thinks he knows enough Latin to teach a beginning class is allowed to try it. Any one who understands conditions in the smaller high schools and many large ones knows that not half the teachers of beginning Latin in this country could pass a rigid examination on the plain essentials of Latin Grammar, while the fraternal spirit forbids me to suggest how small a per cent would be able to pass a Harvard entrance examination in the subject. Worst of all, this state of affairs exists just when the stress of time needs teachers with such a mastery of the subject as to be able to know relative values, and when something mustbe slighted, to place the emphasis on the most indispensible points. The recognition of this defect is seen especially in practically all the beginning texts of the past five years, and in the effort to make their books self-teaching, apparently the only recourse, the authors have introduced the most copious explanations and illustrations, - a work that could better be done orally by a competent teacher if there were only enough of these to be relied upon.

The first three reasons named have been in operation everywhere, and the last has helped in most places to make it constantly more difficult to accomplish satisfactory results in first year Latin teaching. But the demand from above has remained unrelenting. Four books of Caesar must be read in the second year or the

school loses its standing with the colleges. To read this amount means that no time can be wasted in preparation at the beginning of that year, - all that must be done in the first year. As it became practically impossible under average circumstances for high school pupils to have such preparation by the beginning of the second year, a breach gradually devoloped between what could and what should be done in the first year Latin. When this discrepancy became painfully evident from the wretched work of classes in Caesar, there began to appear the annual crop of texts intended to remedy this defect. And as each failed to bridge the gulf, going down in the attempt, others were always forth-coming and so the procession of offerings has continued uninterruptedly and still goes on. Some have been accorded a measure of popularity on the basis we formerly used in honoring our unsuccessful Arctic explorers, because they were among those coming nearest the accomplishment of a seemingly impossible feat. Their task has been as diffucult as classic mariners found the passage of the dread strait of Pelorus. The authors who try to furnish a text that pupils can master founder on the rocks of Scylla and hear her dogs bark out "It's too easy! It doesn't prepare for Caesar!" The other half go down in the whirlpool of Charybdis and hear her thrice-echoed groan "It's too hard! Our pupils can't master it!"

The early years of this modern epoch were spent in experimentation with new plans for saving elementary Latin from its evident

decline under the changing conditions. Out of these attempts came three fairly distinct types which have persisted till the present time, as all later texts have been in general adaptations, improvements or combinations of these three systems. The pedagogic world of that time was emphasizing the Inductive Method, and it was hoped that this would prove the panacea for restoring Latin, so half the beginning texts that appeared in the eighties bore that label. First came Tetlow's Inductive Lessons in Latin, with a justification of its right to exist inscribed on the title-page in the shape of two quotations from Herbert Spencer's Essay on Education. It was a real departure though somewhat timid and compromising in many points with the older methods. The plan required that the inflections be learned directly from either of the three grammars to which it gave references. Then order, idioms and syntax were worked out inductively. A list of examples with translations would be given with their classical source attested by a parenthesis in each case. Questions followed intended to induce a conclusion or rule from the examples. Next was given "References for Verification" to the grammars. Experience suggests that the boys probably turned to the grammar reference for the rule without spending much time in intermediate inference. Its subject matter was drawn from various classic authors and the vocabulary covered about 2000 words. Its chief weakness was in the fact that the proper teaching of it required more time than former methods, instead of less as the new

conditions demanded.

Two other inductive texts deserving of mention appeared almost together four or five years later, the Inductive Latin Method by Harper and Burgess, and the first Bellum Helvetium by Lowe and Butler. The former is the most perfect modern exemplification of the methods of Latin teaching as laid down by Roger Ascham in his "Schole-Master". The first twenty-nine chapters of Caesar furnish the basis for the lessons, but the pupil in not expected in the first two months' work to translate any of this original text. With the first three chapters of text, divided into eighteen lessons, an interlinear literal translation is given, corresponding word to word. After this the pupil may find in the appendix a literal translation for the first four chapters and a free translation for the next five. Chapters thirteen and fourteen are also literally translated. This translated text the pupil is expected to master thoroughly, and following each day's passage are numerous grammar references covering all new points in it, which are also to be learned. Next are given generous lists of exercises for translation into English and into Latin involving the vocabulary and constructions both of that day's text and all that has preceded. Constructions and inflections are taken up of course in the order in which they first occur in Caesar. Extreme emphasis is placed on requiring the pupils to translate the Latin in its own order without looking ahead for the subject or predicate. If

all beginners were possessed of a conscientious determination to become thoroughly proficient Latin scholars, this text would furnish a most excellent introduction.

The Bellum Helvetium appearing in 1889, only a few months after the Harper text, resembles it in many ways. The same part of Caesar is taken as the basis, but this is not translated for the pupil outright. Instead sufficient aid is given in the vocabularies and notes to enable him to do it. Four lessons are spent on the first ten lines, memorizing them, translating them, and recombining the words into new sentences without involving any change of form or construction. Not till after all this is any hint given of inflections, which begin with the first declension in "Pensum Quintum", Latin terminology and even directions being used wherever at all practicable. Besides grammar references on all points as they occur, an appendix contains all the grammar necessary. Many teachers believed that this plan pointed to the best solution of the beginning Latin problem so the book has been frequently revised in the attempt to make it usable. The original authors tried it three years after its first publication. Then Prof. Walker worked it over in 1897, and finally in 1906 Messrs. Janes and Jenks rewrote it into its present form. In the revision the inductive method was gradually eliminated and had been abandoned by text writers in general. The present Bellum Helveticum (the name was changed in the first revision) begins with ten intro-

ductory lessons on forms, and after the Caesar is begun, the purpose is to prepare the pupil for every new point just before it arises. The book is usable and fairly effective but can not under ordinary circumstances be satisfactorily completed by a beginning high school class in one year.

Another kind of text may be called the "rigorous" type and an early representative is found in Comstock's First Latin Book published in 1883. He believed that ignorance of English grammar was the chief source of difficulty, so his first sixteen pages are given to a concise review of that subject. When the pupil is thus equipped, he is unrelentingly given every phrase of preparation that his high school Latin reading could ever require. No opportunity is given at any point for a short cut or escape from thoroughness. By the proper use of such a text the author felt sure that pupils would be prepared to read Caesar, which is quite true if only the curriculum were arranged so as to permit that proper and thorough mastery which he means.

The fact that pupils were no longer able to complete satisfactorily in one year any of the first Latin books extant resulted in a third type of text, the kind that reduced the standard to the level of the pupil's capabilities, beset as he is by the modern courses of study. From its first publication in 1886, the most popular representative of this type has been the text of Collar and Daniell. In the first edition, called The Beginner's Latin Book,

the atuhors frankly confess that "those who seek in a first Latin book a complete presentation of the facts and principles of the Latin language,will not be satisfied with this volume".[1] Nor do they claim that it gives a thorough preparation for Caesar, though they suggest their "hope"[1] that the "transition then to Viri Romae, Nepos or Caesar will not prove too difficult"[1]. Their purpose was to construct a book that could "be finished and reviewed by the average learner in a year"[1] and "to impart something of attractiveness, interest, freshness and variety to the study of the elements of Latin by means of the Colloquia, the choice of extracts for translation (introduced as early as possible), and the mode of treatment in every part, extending even to the choice of Latin words, and to the construction of many of the exercises".[1] Inflections are not massed so as to cause continous demands on the memory, and constructions are introduced in what was considered their relative order of difficulty. In 1894 the same authors put out their "First Latin Book" on the same plan, but easier and intended to require only two-thirds as much time, and to be followed by Viri Romae or similiar reading before Caesar is begun. Then in 1901 was published their present text, First Year Latin, mainly a revision of the "First Latin Book" with the addition of selections for reading to fill out the year, but not at all so difficult as the original "Beginner's Lain Book". These texts have unquestionably been the most popular first Latin books in use in America for

1.Preface, The Beginner's Latin Book.

the past twenty years and the latest announcement of the publishers indicates that the "First Year Latin" is now used in far more schools than all competitors combined.

The reason for this popularity is obvious. Is is the only text that meets present conditions by reducing the demands on the pupil's time and energy to the level set by his other subjects and his previous training. Moreover it can be used without embarrassment by a teacher having less knowledge of Latin and less teaching ability than other texts require. The weaknesses of the text have often been pointed out. Its arrangement is often illogical, introducing unimportant constructions in connections that exaggerate their importance. For example, the dative of possessor comes so early that pupils almost invariably come to regard it as a difficult and ever-threatening absurdity, instead of a simple trick of emphasis as it appears when introduced in its proper place. Its sentences for translation are sometimes inane and much of the vocabulary not what the pupil will need later. Finally, except in the hands of an unusually gifted teacher, it furnishes at best a poor preparation for Caesar. But because it is teachable and comes nearest silencing the groans of the first year it continues in vogue. With the exception perhaps of the Bellum Helveticum, no rival text has succeeded as yet in maintaining a reasonable degree of popularity for any considerable time.

Of the first year Latin books appearing during the nineties, only a few deserve any detailed mention. In 1890 Harkness pub-

lished his Easy Latin Method, the most beautifully printed, finely illustrated and interesting-looking first Latin book ever published in this country. It was a great departure from the grim Harkness series of twenty years before. An adaptation of the inductive method, was used, or as the author says "the method of treatment is largely inductive, but not excessively so". Latin examples to encourage inference precede and at least illustrate every rule. It contains more than a hundred regular lessons with copious exercises, a size not adapted to the first year of high school.

Another text somewhat on the plan of the later Bellum Helveticum is Coy's Latin Lessons. Connected Latin is believed to furnish the most interesting and helpful basis for daily reading, so after the plainest fundamentals are given, a section of Viri Romae is a part of eachlesson,until the pupil is ready for one life from Nepos, and later for a selection from Caesar. It had considerable popularity for a while, and probably influenced the later revisions of the Bellum Helveticum.

The text of this period coming nearest the Collar and Daniell type is A First Book in Latin by Tuell and Fowler. Its opening lessons are strangely like that text, but the latter partis much more exacting. Very few verb forms are given till after the third declension is reached. A simplified, connected story of the first book of Caesar running through the lessons serves the double purpose of gaining sustained interest, and teaching the vocabulary of Caesar, with the added value of making familiar that author's

style and subject matter. To keep the book within the limits of beginners' capacity, the vocabulary was confined to about 700 words, mostly those commonest in Caesar. In general it seems to have come nearer the solution of the beginning problem than any other text published before the present decade.

In 1898 there was published the most pronounced modern example of the "rigorous" type of text already mentioned, Bennett's Foundations of Latin. Its plan is that advocated in "The Teaching of Latin" by the same author, whose contributions to the science of the language are fortunately much more valuable than anything he has added to its pedagogy. It is practically a return to the methods in vogue in the seventies when as every one knows, beginners mastered their inflections much better than they do now. The order of the grammar is followed throughout, except for the introduction of the present indicative active of the first conjugation and of sum in the first two lessons. First and second declension adjectives are moved up to follow the corresponding nouns, and the obvious syntax of subject and object is of course presented with the first sentences. Most of the forms, such as datives, genitives and ablatives are carried by the pupil for three whole months before he has any hint of their use or significance. Just after he naturally concludes that they have none, and are simply empty tread-mills for his discipline, suddenly six mystifying uses of the dative are unloaded upon him in a heap. It reminds one of

the overwhelming floods that sometimes follow a protracted drought and bury the meager fruits of a season's toil.

The book itself is of modest appearance, almost tiny. It looks so easy to any one who already knows the inflections and their significance, and promises so much that it met at once a really wide adoption. One dreary year usually sufficed. It was revised in 1902 and the translation exercise lengthened. Then in the effort to save it, the text was last year entirely rewritten and renamed. The lessons are divided into smaller offerings, postponing the syntax still more, but except for the interpolation of selections from Caesar rather early, which from want of syntax have to be translated almost outright in the notes, the plan is still the same, with no apparent recognition of the change that has taken place in high school conditions during the past thirty years.

Nothing noteworthy has survived from the next few years preceding our present half decade. The Smiley and Storke text is one of the best examples, being an attempt to combine the various types. Interest is sought by alternation of noun and verb forms, passages from Caesar are frequent, and the extended translation exercises make for thoroughness. Still more rigorous was Moore's First Latin Book, which was rewritten three years ago with the help of Prof. Schlicher and made much more usable, but still aiming at thoroughness through abundant practice in translation.

The majority of the texts that have been put out within the past five years are strikingly similar. The efforts of the past generation through the survival of the fittest seem to have worked out a common type that characterizes the newest and best texts. The general characteristics are, first, a restricted and carefully chosen vocabulary of 500 to 800 words most commonly used in Caesar; second the alternation, from the beginning, of noun and verb forms so as to secure the freest and most diversified application of material already learned; third, the generous employment of connected narrative, and fourth, the incorporation from a fairly early stage of a considerable amount of the text of Caesar, either directly or with some simplification. The differences are mainly in pedagogic details, and this should perhaps be added as a common likeness, the attempt to make the books self-teaching by copious explanations, illustrations and suggestions for presentation covering especially English grammar as needed, no working knowledge of which is assumed. Six texts should be mentioned especially as having the general characteristics just named. First, Pearson's Essentials, a text unusually concise in treatment and restricted in vocabulary. Second, Gunnison and Harley's the only one using the Caesar verbatim, very thorough but over-scholarly and unnecessarily difficult. Third, the Smith-Laing, excellent in presentation of new points, but sometimes giving difficult sentences for translation without adequate preparation. Fourth, Moulton's one of the most logically

and economically arranged texts yet prepared. Fifth, Barss", notable for its really vitalizing illustrations and very full of teaching hints, devices and directions. Sixth, Inglis and Prettyman's, already mentioned as adapting for the opening lessons the plan of Arnold's First and Second Latin Book; from every point of view, one of the best the writer has yet seen; especially strong in natural gradation and perfect preparation, so that nothing is forced upon the pupil.

At least two of the newer texts depart from this type. Muzzy's Beginner's Book uses what may be termed the lecture method. It follows in general Bennett's plan, and not a single sentence for translation is given in the first twenty-five chapters, covering perhaps two months' work. These are to be supplied in oral form by the teacher so the correction may be made at once, and the whole process is sugar-coated with pages of confidential explanation, comparison and encouragement to keep up the pupil's spirits while learning the inflections.

The new First Latin Book by Prof. Hale stands apart as the most thorough-going attempt yet made to apply the so-called natural method to the teaching of Latin. The exercises are on subjects naturally most interesting to youngsters, rules are worked out inductively, and the directions as well as mode of treatment remind one of Froebel. The book seems to contain considerable material usually reserved for graduate students, but is declared

to have been successful in the hands of the specially prepared teachers using it. Its practicability under ordinary conditions has hardly yet been demonstrated.

This list of first year Latin texts in America is not meant to include all that have ever appeared. But the effort was made to discover the principles involved in all that have won conspicuous popularity or have influenced later texts and methods, or if still comparatively untried , bear promise of influencing our present teaching of Latin. Fully half a score of those mentioned are able, in the hands of an unusually excellent teacher, to furnish a satisfactory preparation for Caesar, but none of them has as yet proved to fulfill that requirement when used by the average teacher under average conditions. The occasional teacher who by reason of genius and faithful preparation is able to make smooth the pathway to Caesar is all the more conspicuous by contrast with the multitude who fail. To such a teacher comes always the temptation to write a text and show others how he does it. As a natural consequence, the number of texts is rapidly approximating the number of successful teachers, especially as an extra one is occasionally written by some college professor with a theory. If these unusual teachers could only accompany their books everywhere, the problem would be solved but without them the vital factor is missing which is indispensible in the attainment of a satisfactory result. For the reasons already enumurated, it is futile to hope

for a text that will be efficient in general use under present conditions.

The relief must come from a change in the Course of Study and the possibilities seem to be only two. First and most desirable is an extension of the time given to first year Latin from five to eight periods each week. Of course the suggestion would bring a howl from the other departments, but it is really desirable from their point of view, especially in English amd Modern Languages. In these latter subjects, a vast percent of time is wasted through inability of students to grasp the relations of words in expressing thought. Time is spent on so-called English Grammar courses, but no commensurate results are gained. On the other hand, Latin is the perfect medium for teaching these relations since its inflections magnify them and compel the student to respect them. Nothing is more common than the remark from students that they knew no grammar until they began Latin. With the added time, double results could be attained. Space would be given for abundant easy reading to accompany the drill work, lighten it and interpret it, instead of coming as an extra burden days later when the forms are forgotten. Beginning Latin rightly taught gives the key to further word-study, language-study and interpretation in any language; especially the mother-tongue. Our first year Latin texts could then contain interesting material arranged for natural, enjoyable progress, instead of being condensed into the grim essentials that can

and must be crammed into the pupil's head. If this added time can not be secured otherwise it would be better to borrow it from the later Latin. A thoroughly prepared beginner after reading Caesar would accomplish more in Cicero on half-time than the modern student who does none of it accurately.

The other possibility is to lessen the demand from above. The plea for that was made at the last meeting of the Classical Association by Mr. Bishop of The Eastern High School of Detroit. It is really less desirable than the first plan, but not requiring sanction from outside the ranks of Latin teachers is more likely to come. When we all realize that only harm can come to the cause of the classics, and doubtful good at best to the student by hurrying him along through a mass of reading wherein he feels no sure footing beneath him and sees no light from above, we will surely discard our unbending requirements that were made under different conditions, and try to adapt our demands to the students as we now find them. Make first year Latin an introduction to language interpretation. Let the study of the forms be vitalized by simple reading and above all teach correct, conscientious habits of applying these inflections in determining the relative value of words in expressing a thought. If he learns these habits thoroughly and respects the most obvious concords, he will, even if he learns no more in the first year, have a surer sense of mastery than the average student beginning Cicero. Build the fundamentals sure, and let complicated syntax wait. On this foundation, spend a third or

a half of the second year preparing for Caesar, and then begin reading his Commentaries without waiting through a three months vaction for the preparation to be forgotten. A surprising amount could then be read, but the number of pages would be unimportant, if the pupils felt an absolute mastery over what was read. This sense of mastery, as has been often said, is the only sure basis of abiding interest, and when that spirit pervades the work of our first two years of Latin, we may hope to inculcate in another generation some of that love of the classics which has caused gray-haired men to treasure yet the worn old volumes of Horace which they used a half century ago, and to repeat from memory that triumphant ode, "Exegi monumentum".

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Allen, Latin Primer. Boston, 1870.

Allen and Grenough, Latin Grammar. Boston, 1872.

Andrews and Stoddard, Latin Grammar. Boston, 1836.

Andrews, First Latin Book (Revised Ed.) Boston, 1848.

Andrews, Latin Lessons. (3rd revision.) Boston, 1864.

Andrews, Latin Exercises. Boston, 1839.

Andrews, Latin Reader. Boston, 1837.

Arnold, First and Second Latin Book. (revised by Spencer)
New York, 1846.

Barss, Beginning Latin. Boston, 1907.

Bennett, Foundation of Latin. Boston, 1898.

Bennett, First Year Latin. Boston, 1909.

Bullions, Latin Grammar. New York, 1846.

Bullions and Morris, Latin Lessons. New York, 1866.

Bullions and Morris, Latin Grammar. New York, 1866.

Collar and Daniell, The Beginner's Latin Book. Boston, 1886.

Collar and Daniell, First Latin Book. Boston, 1894.

Collar and Daniell, First Year Latin. Boston, 1902.

Comstock, First Latin Book. Boston, 1883.

Coy, Latin Lessons. New York, 1895.

Gunnison and Harley, The First Year of Latin. New York, 1902.

Hale, First Latin Book. Chicago, 1907.

Harkness, Latin Grammar. New York, 1865.

Harkness, Introductory Latin Book. New York, 1866.

Harkness, Easy Latin Method. New York, 1890.

Harper and Burgess, Inductive Latin Method. New York, 1888.

Hough, History and Statistical Record of the University of New York. Albany, 1885.

Inglis and Prettyman, First Book in Latin. New York, 1907.

Janes and Jenks, Bellum Helveticum. Chicago, 1906.

Jones, First Lessons in Latin. Chicago, 1877.

Kemp, History of Education . Philadelphia, 1902.

Kittredge, Some Landmarks in the History of Latin Grammars. Boston, 1903.

Leighton, Latin Lessons. Boston, 1876.

Lowe and Butler, Bellum Helveticum. Chicago, 1889.

Mair, Introduction to Latin Syntax (from Edinburgh Stereotype Edition) New York, 1827.

Moore and Schlicher, Elements of Latin. New York, 1906.

Moulton, Introductory Latin. Boston, 1907.

Murray, History of Education in New Jersey (U. S. Bureau of Ed.) Washington, 1899.

Muzzey, A Beginner's Book in Latin. New York, 1907.

North American Review, 1820 - 1830.

Pearson, Essentials of Latin. New York, 1905.

Richards, Latin Lessons. Boston, 1859.

Smith - Laing, First Latin Lessons. Boston, 1907.

Tetlow, Inductive Latin Lessons. Boston, 1884.

Tuell and Fowler, A First Book in Latin. Boston, 1893.

U. S. Commissioner of Education Reports. Washington,
1870 - 1902.

Weld, Latin Lessons and Reader. Portland, 1845.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 086857684